

## **II. RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Harvey (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,568) in view of Logan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,493,680).

Looking first at claim 1, the broadest pending claim, it is required that a first and second service operation be performed at a well site, the invoice data of each service operation being inputted into a first computer located at a well site, and then a communication of the first and second invoice data from the first computer to a second computer using a wireless communication link. These elements are not disclosed in the Harvey/Logan combination. First, Harvey deals solely with delivering oilfield data from a data acquisition site to a remote delivery site. Quite simply, Harvey does not deal with invoice data entered at the website. In other words, Harvey deals primarily with data, and does not deal with the field aspect of product deliveries and invoicing, as claimed in the present invention. Nowhere in Harvey is it disclosed that invoicing is part of the Harvey invention.

Logan does not fill the oil field invoicing void in Harvey. Logan deals with a method of processing bills, not with receiving invoice data from an oilfield. For instance, Logan deals with a centralized billing system that may, or may not, be used in the present invention at the remote location after the oilfield invoice data is transferred from the second computer to the first computer. What is claimed in the present invention is performing a first and second service operation, and inputting the invoices for these operations into a computer located at the wellsite, and transmitting the invoices to a central location. Logan does not describe handling discrete invoicing for products and services rendered at a site and transmitted to a central location. This


is also not described in Harvey, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Harvey and Logan does not disclose each and every element of the pending claims, and therefore the claims as written are allowable.

Given the arguments in support of the patentability of claim 1, Applicant submits that because claim 1 is the broadest independent claim, the same arguments pertain to the other pending independent claims and all dependent claims currently pending in this application.

In view of the above, claims 1-21 are respectfully submitted as being clearly distinct and patentable over the art of record and therefore Applicants respectfully request their entry and allowance by the Examiner. Applicants believe the application will then be in position for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at 713-787-1516, or by email at [steinheiderm@howrey.com](mailto:steinheiderm@howrey.com) with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted



Matthew F. Steinheider  
Reg. No. 47,968  
Attorney for Applicant

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE,  
LLP  
750 Bering Drive  
Houston, Texas 77057-2198  
(713) 787-1400

Date: 5/26/04